

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION**

UNILOC 2017 LLC,	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00491-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00492-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00493-JRG-RSP
<i>Plaintiff,</i>	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00496-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00497-JRG-RSP
v.	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00499-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00501-JRG-RSP
GOOGLE LLC,	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00502-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00503-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00504-JRG-RSP
<i>Defendant.</i>	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00548-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00550-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00551-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00552-JRG-RSP
	§	Case No. 2:18-cv-00553-JRG-RSP

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiff Uniloc 2017 LLC’s (“Uniloc”) Motion to Amend Docket Control Order (the “Motion”). Uniloc moves to adopt two additions: (1) to add the requirement to comply with this Court’s standing order regarding subject-matter eligibility contentions (dated July 25, 2019), and (2) to add the requirement that the parties identify the patent claims and prior art references to be tried in the case in the Joint Pretrial Order.

After consideration, the Court **GRANTS IN PART** the Motion. The Motion is **DENIED** as to (1) the requirement regarding subject-matter eligibility contentions, but the Motion is **GRANTED** as to (2) the requirement that the parties identify the patent claims and prior art references to be tried in the case in the Joint Pretrial Order. Thus, the parties shall comply with the requirement for the Joint Pretrial Order, which states:

Joint Pretrial Order: In the contentions of the Parties included in the Joint Pretrial Order, the Plaintiff shall specify all allegedly infringed claims that will be asserted at trial. The Plaintiff shall also specify the nature of each theory of infringement, including under which subsections of 35 U.S.C. § 271 it alleges infringement, and whether the Plaintiff alleges divided infringement or infringement under the doctrine of equivalents. Each

Defendant shall indicate the nature of each theory of invalidity, including invalidity for anticipation, obviousness, subject-matter eligibility, written description, enablement, or any other basis for invalidity. The Defendant shall also specify each prior art reference or combination of references upon which the Defendant shall rely at trial, with respect to each theory of invalidity. The contentions of the Parties may not be amended, supplemented, or dropped without leave of the Court based upon a showing of good cause.

The Court *sua sponte* further **ORDERS** the parties to abide by the following instructions in regard to Juror Questionnaires:

If a juror questionnaire is to be used, an editable (in Microsoft Word format) questionnaire shall be jointly submitted to the Deputy Clerk in Charge by this date.¹

SIGNED this 19th day of February, 2020.


ROY S. PAYNE
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

¹ The Parties are referred to the Court's Standing Order Regarding Use of Juror Questionnaires in Advance of *Voir Dire*.